

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The examiner has objected to claims 11-13 because of a typographical error resulting in improper claim dependency. Claims 11-13 have been amended to claim dependency on claim 10 as originally intended and as the examiner has suggested.

The examiner has rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as having improper antecedent basis for the term “said print processor and said user input.” Claim 14 has been amended to correct this improper antecedent basis.

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 20 has been amended to more specifically claim this subject matter.

Claims 1, 4, 10-13, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,825,943). Claim 1, and claim 4 by dependency have been amended to more specifically claim “user manipulation” of the index file to effect a document page “format” manipulation. Barry et al do not disclose user manipulation of the much different “control file” of that reference. Barry discloses a “control file” that is used by their system to determine the number of pages in a file so that the file can be split among multiple RIP engines for parallel processing. The control file of Barry et al is not a page-independent file, nor does it allow format manipulation. The control file of Barry et al is not manipulable at all, but simply contains data that is used to “control” whether parallel RIP processing is to be performed. Claim 1, as amended, and claim 4, by dependency, claim user manipulation and format manipulation that are not taught in Barry et al.

Claim 10 has been amended to classify the manipulation of the index file as being performed "by user input." This limitation, as discussed above, is not taught in Barry et al, which discloses only a "control file" that carries file page data. Accordingly, claim 10 and claims 11-13, dependent thereon, as amended, are not anticipate or rendered obvious by Barry et al.

The rejection of claim 19 is improper as it fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness. Claim 19 comprises the limitation of "manipulating said index file to effect document formatting options." Barry et al do not teach document formatting options in relation to an index file or any other type of file. Barry et al only teach a simple "control file" that contains data for calculating the number of pages in a print job. This data is then used to "control" whether the print job is split into parallel RIP jobs. This is much different that the index file of the present invention, which allows document formatting as claimed in claim 19. Accordingly, claim 19 has not been amended and is believed to be patentable in its current form.

Claims 2, 3, 5-9, and 14-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,825,943) in view of applicant's submitted prior art in the specification. Claims 2, 3 & 5-9 are dependent on claim 1, which has been amended to more specifically claim patentable subject matter as explained above in relation to claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be patentable by dependency on amended claim 1.


Claim 14 has been amended to more particularly claim that the modifying is performed "through user input." Barry et al do not teach the manipulation of a file by user input, as explained above in relation to other claims.

Claims 15-17 are dependent on claim 14 and, therefore, comprise all the limitation in claim 14. These claims are thought to be patentable for the same reasons stated in relation to claim 14 above.

The rejection of claim 18 is improper as it fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness. Claim 18 comprises the limitation of "a modifier for modifying said index file to effect document formatting options." Barry et al do not teach document formatting options in relation to an index file or any other type of file. Accordingly, this claim is believed to be patentable in its original form.

In light of the arguments above, all claims, as amended, are considered to be novel, non-obvious and patentable in view of the cited art. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner promptly allow these claims and proceed with issuance of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact applicant's attorney directly for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Scott C. Krieger  
Reg. No. 42,768  
Tel No. (360) 931-6406